## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA NORTHERN DIVISION

JAMES TROUPE, #258 351,	)
Plaintiff,	)
v.	) CASE NO. 2:20-CV-868-WHA-JTA
JOHNNIE MAE MATTHEW, et al.,	) [WO]
Defendants.	)

## RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

On November 13, 2020, the Court directed Plaintiff to forward to the Clerk of Court an initial partial filing fee in the amount of \$27.17. Doc. 5 at 2. Plaintiff was cautioned his failure to comply with the Order would result in a Recommendation his Complaint be dismissed. Doc. 5 at 3.

The time to comply with the November 13, 2020, Order, as extended by Orders entered December 1, 2020 and February 12, 2021, expired on March 1, 2021, and Plaintiff has not submitted the initial partial filing fee. The Court, therefore, concludes this case is due to be dismissed. *Moon v. Newsome*, 863 F.2d 835, 837 (11th Cir. 1989) (explaining that as a general rule, where a litigant has been forewarned, dismissal for failure to obey a court order is not an abuse of discretion.); *see also Tanner v. Neal*, 232 F. App'x 924 (11th Cir. 2007) (affirming *sua sponte* dismissal without prejudice of inmate's § 1983 action for failure to file an amended complaint in compliance with court's prior order directing amendment and warning of consequences for failure to comply).

Accordingly, it is the RECOMMENDATION of the Magistrate Judge that this case

be DISMISSED without prejudice for Plaintiff's failures to prosecute this action and

comply with the orders of this Court.

Plaintiff may file an objection to the Recommendation on or before May 10, 2021.

Any objection filed must specifically identify the factual findings and legal conclusions in

the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation to which Plaintiff objects. Frivolous, conclusive

or general objections will not be considered by the District Court. This Recommendation

is not a final order and, therefore, it is not appealable.

Failure to file a written objection to the proposed findings and recommendations in

the Magistrate Judge's report shall bar a party from a *de novo* determination by the District

Court of factual findings and legal issues covered in the report and shall "waive the right

to challenge on appeal the district court's order based on unobjected-to factual and legal

conclusions" except upon grounds of plain error if necessary in the interests of justice.

11TH Cir. R. 3-1; see Resolution Trust Co. v. Hallmark Builders, Inc., 996 F.2d 1144, 1149

(11th Cir. 1993); Henley v. Johnson, 885 F.2d 790, 794 (11th Cir. 1989).

DONE this 23rd day of April, 2021.

EKUSHA T. ADAMS

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

2